

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants acknowledge, with thanks, receipt of the office action dated November 7, 2007, and completion of the personal interview of January 16, 2008. The Examiner's observations and suggestions are much appreciated and summarized herein.

Claims 1-12 and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0054106 to Anderson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,828 to Pham et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,460 to Hajmiragha and U.S. Patent No. 6,289,460 to Hanson.

As noted during the interview, the subject application teaches a peer-based system by which each of a plurality of authorized users is able to create a common data storage and can designate those users to whom such storage is accessible. In earlier systems, it was incumbent on a system administrator to setup and allocate private or semi-private file storage areas. If a user desired to set up such a file storage, they would have to compete for attention of the administrator, and communicate to that administrator the need for the dedicated storage area. The user would then need to communicate to the administrator those users to whom access should be given to meet the current need. The administrator would need to set aside time to allocate the storage, and to notify those approved users about its existence. It is to be appreciated that a similar procedure would be necessary each time a modification to storage area parameters was needed, such as deleting it once its usefulness is ended, or adding or deleting users as may be required for a particular situation. The magnitude of administrative burden would be substantial, particularly in the large enterprise environments most likely to benefit by implementation of such selective storage areas.

In order to easily address logistical issues associated with multiple users or peers who are enabled to setup secure storage areas, the subject application further teaches setup which is accomplished via users acting through a thin client. The subject application accomplishes its document receipt and subsequent sharing in accordance with rights and privileges associated with a data storage area, not on attributes associated with documents, themselves. Such thin client file based administration facilitates concurrent, network-based setup of storage areas.

None of the art of record, alone or in combination, teaches the peer-based allocation of shared, private storage that facilitates receipt, storage and controlled, shared access to electronic documents as discussed above. Hajmiragha speaks of remote document collaboration, but teaches collaboration via documents which are designated for specified users. See, e.g., col., lines 1-20. No

teaching is made relative to establishing and setting parameters relative to storage and access to any document received into the designated storage.

In view of the forgoing, amendment to each of independent claims 1, 7 and 19 has been made to render more clearly the patentable distinctions over the art of record. For the reasons noted above, it is submitted that all claims, as clarified via amendment, are far removed from the art of record and in condition for allowance thereover.

An early allowance of all claims is respectfully urged.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/33305.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan L. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3466
Fax: (216) 592-5009

Date: 1-31-08